GM Crops & Food ›
Biotechnology in Agriculture and the Food Chain
Volume 8, 2017 - Issue 3

Research Papers

Farm income and production impacts of using GM crop technology 1996–2015

Graham Brookes & Peter Barfoot

Pages 156-193 | Received 10 Feb 2017, Accepted 04 Apr 2017, Published online: 19 Jun 2017

Cite this article https://doi.org/10.1080/21645698.2017.1317919 Check for updates

ABSTR

This pap ed (GM) crop
technolo nual studies
which ex farm (gross)
income s, corn,
cotto oid rate
since option and
impact c ntinues to
be very 5.4 billion in
2015 an s). These
gains ha farmers in
developi production
gains wi s also made

having, for example, added 180 million tonnes and 358 million tonnes respectively, to the global production of soybeans and maize since the introduction of the technology in the mid 1990s.

KEYWORDS: cost genetically modified crops income production yield

INTRODUCTION

2015 represents the twentieth year of widespread cultivation of crops containing genetically modified (GM) traits, with the global planted area of GM-traited crops at about 172 million hectares.

During this 20-year period, there have been many papers assessing the farm level ‘economic’ and farm income impacts associated with the adoption of this technology. The authors of this paper have, since 2005, engaged in an annual exercise to aggregate and update the sum of these various studies, and where possible and appropriate, to supplement this with new analysis. The aim of this has been to provide an up to date and as accurate as possible assessment of some of the key farm level ‘economic’ impacts associated with the global adoption of crops containing GM traits. It is also
hoped th impact of
this tech in countries
where cr

This stuc GM crops
since the s for 2015.
Previous nals,
includ ernational
Journ GM Crops
3:4, 265 d Barfoot,
2013), G 6 (Brookes
and Barf
methodo anged to
allow a c ever, note
that som ta presented

Article contents Related research

in previous analysis because the current paper takes into account the availability of new data and analysis (including revisions to data for earlier years).

To save readers of this paper the chore of consulting the past papers for details of the methodology and arguments, these are included in full in this updated paper.

The analysis concentrates on gross farm income effects because these are a primary driver of adoption among farmers (both large commercial and small-scale subsistence). It also quantifies the (net) production impact of the technology. The authors recognize that an economic assessment could examine a broader range of potential impacts (eg, on labor usage, households, local communities and economies).

However, these are not included because undertaking such an exercise would add considerably to the length of the paper and an assessment of wider economic impacts would probably merit a separate assessment in its own right.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

HT Crops

The main impact of GM HT (largely tolerant to the broad spectrum herbicide
glyphos nsive) and
easier w y have also
derived ained from
conventi y and year,
and is m systems
versus c d, the cost
farmers ms. The
follo ecent years
should b

- The m al crops
  are aff le both
  'older' nt-
  protec f suppliers
  to mar s to

2009, the average cost associated with the use of GM HT technology globally increased significantly relative to earlier years because of the increase in the global price of glyphosate relative to changes in the price of other herbicides commonly used on conventional crops. This abated in 2010 with a decline in the price of glyphosate back to previous historic trend levels;

- The amount farmers pay for use of the technology varies by country. Pricing of technology (all forms of seed and crop protection technology, not just GM technology) varies according to the level of benefit that farmers are likely to derive from it. In addition, it is influenced by intellectual property rights (patent protection, plant breeders' rights and rules relating to use of farm-saved seed). In countries with weaker intellectual property rights, the cost of the technology tends to be lower than in countries where there are stronger rights. This is examined further in c) below;

- Where GM HT crops (tolerant to glyphosate) have been widely grown, some incidence of weed resistance to glyphosate has occurred and resistance has become a major concern in some regions. This has been attributed to how glyphosate was used; because of its broad-spectrum post-emergence activity, it was often used as the sole method of weed control. This approach to weed control put tremendous selection pressure on weeds and as a result contributed to the
  evolut s. It
  should cies
  confirr
  (www. currently
  (acces ed species
  resista entional
  soybea herbicides
  (eg e noted
  that ing the
  adopti uth
  Americ esistant to
  herbic that are
  not we e
  increa des (with

> glyphosate have not been found. This change in weed management emphasis also reflects the broader agenda of developing strategies across all forms of cropping systems to minimise and slow down the potential for weeds developing resistance to existing technology solutions (Norsworthy et al., 2012). At the macro level, these changes have influenced the mix, total amount, cost and overall profile of herbicides applied to GM HT crops. Relative to the conventional alternative, however, the economic impact of the GM HT crop use has continued to offer important advantages for most users. It should also be noted that many of the herbicides used in conventional production systems had significant resistance issues themselves in the mid 1990s. This was one of the reasons why glyphosate tolerant soybeans were rapidly adopted, as glyphosate provided good control of these weeds. If the GM HT technology was no longer delivering net economic benefits, it is likely that farmers around the world would have significantly reduced their adoption of this technology in favor of conventional alternatives. The fact that GM HT global crop adoption levels have not fallen in recent years suggests that farmers must be continuing to derive important economic benefits from using the technology.

These points are further illustrated in the analysis below.

GM HT Soybeans

The aver ology are
summar eduction in
the cost l
(herbicid ements in
the leve igher, in
countrie HT
soyb Canada in
2009 generation
(and the n of this
potentia 1).

TABL
level

GM HT soybeans have also facilitated the adoption of no tillage production systems, shortening the production cycle. This advantage has enabled many farmers in South America to plant a crop of soybeans immediately after a wheat crop in the same growing season. This second crop, additional to traditional soybean production, has added considerably to farm incomes and to the volumes of soybean production in countries such as Argentina and Paraguay.

Overall, in 2015, GM HT technology in soybeans (excluding second generation ‘Intacta’ soybeans: see below) has boosted gross farm incomes by $3.82 billion, and since 1996 has delivered $50 billion of extra farm income. Of the total cumulative farm income gains from using GM HT soybeans, $23.6 billion (47%) has been due to yield gains/second crop benefits and the balance, 53%, has been due to cost savings.

GM HT and IR (Intacta) Soybeans

This combination of GM herbicide tolerance (to glyphosate) and insect resistance in soybeans was first grown commercially in 2013, in South America. In the first 3 years, the technology was used on approximately 22.3 million hectares and contributed an additional $2.4 billion to gross farm income of soybean farmers in Argentina, Brazil, Paragua xpenditure on herbi

GM HT

The ado on, although yield gai the Philippin

TABL me impac

Downlo

In 2015, 1.8 billion

Article contents
Related research

$3.44 billion (31%) was due to yield gains and the rest derived from lower costs of production.

GM HT Cotton

The use of GM HT cotton delivered a gross farm income gain of about $116.7 million in 2015. In the 1996–2015 period, the total gross farm income benefit was $1.77 billion. As with other GM HT traits, these farm income gains have mainly arisen from cost savings (73% of the total gains), although there have been some yield gains in Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and Colombia (Table 3).

TABLE 3. GM HT cotton summary of average gross farm income impacts 1996–2015 ($/hectare).

Download CSV Display Table

Other HT Crops

GM HT canola (tolerant to glyphosate or glufosinate) has been grown in Canada, the US, and more recently Australia, while GM HT sugar beet is grown in the US and
Canada. ese
technolo he benefit
has deri adoption of
GM HT t vely since
1996, it

TAB
in

Downlo

GM IR

The mai has been
through lds (Table 5

TABLE 5. Average (%) yield gains GM IR cotton and maize 1996–2015.

Download CSV Display Table

The greatest improvement in yields has occurred in developing countries, where conventional methods of pest control have been least effective (eg, reasons such as less well developed extension and advisory services, lack of access to finance to fund use of crop protection application equipment and products), with any cost savings associated with reduced insecticide use being mostly found in developed countries. These effects can be seen in the level of farm income gains that have arisen from the adoption of these technologies, as shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6. GM IR crops: Average gross farm income benefit 1996–2015 ($/hectare).

Download CSV Display Table

At the ag … R maize and
cotton ir … ly since
1996, th … GM IR
cotton.

Aggreg

GM crop … rm income,
whic … 5.2% to the
value … nd cotton.
Since 19

At the c … er incomes,
realizing … not
surprisir … rop
technolo … ave been in

America (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Paraguay and Uruguay), mostly from GM technology in soybeans and maize. GM IR cotton has also been responsible for an additional $38.2 billion additional income for cotton farmers in China and India.

In 2015, 48.7% of the farm income benefits were earned by farmers in developing countries. The vast majority of these gains have been from GM IR cotton and GM HT soybeans. Over the 20 y 1996–2015, the cumulative farm income gain derived by developing country farmers was $86.1 billion, equal to 51.3% of the total farm income during this period.

The cost to farmers for accessing GM technology, across the 4 main crops, in 2015, was equal to 29% of the total value of technology gains. This is defined as the farm income gains referred to above plus the cost of the technology payable to the seed supply chain. Readers should note that the cost of the technology accrues to the seed supply chain including sellers of seed to farmers, seed multipliers, plant breeders, distributors and the GM technology providers.

In developing countries, the total cost was equal to 20% of total technology gains compared with 36% in developed countries. While circumstances vary between countries, the higher share of total technology gains accounted for by farm income in developing countries relative to developed countries reflects factors such as weaker
provision ... ntries and
the high ... s in
developi

Seventy ... es from
higher y ... ostly on
insectici ... ance and
herbicid ... tal income
gain ... ative to cost
savings ... d. Thus in
2015 the ... nd 16%
from cos

Crop P

Based o ... ons above

have added important volumes to global production of corn, cotton, canola and soybeans since 1996 (Table 7).

TABLE 7. Additional crop production arising from positive yield effects of GM crops.

Download CSV Display Table

The GM IR traits, used in maize and cotton, have accounted for 94.7% of the additional maize production and 98.9% of the additional cotton production. Positive yield impacts from the use of this technology have occurred in all user countries, except for GM IR cotton in Australia where the levels of Heliothis sp (boll and bud worm pests) pest control previously obtained with intensive insecticide use were very good. The main benefit and reason for adoption of this technology in Australia has arisen from significant cost savings and the associated environmental gains from reduced insecticide use, when compared with average yields derived from crops using conventional technology (such as application of insecticides and seed treatments). The average yield impact across the total area planted to these traits over the 20 y since 1996 has been +13.1% for maize and +15% for cotton.

As indica
cost effe
the impr
The mai
facilitati
has enal
after a w
tradi
Argenti
HT-relate
5.84 mil

rovide more
oving yields,
ne countries.
the
e and how it
mediately
l to
roduction in
the total GM
r

CONC

Article contents Related research

The use of crop biotechnology, by 18 million farmers in 2015, has delivered important farm income benefits over the 20-year period to 2015. The GM IR traits have mostly delivered higher incomes through improved yields in all countries. Many farmers, especially in developed countries, have also benefited from lower costs of production (less expenditure on insecticides). The GM HT technology-driven farm income gains have mostly arisen from reduced costs of production, notably on weed control. In South America, the technology has also facilitated the move away from conventional to low/no-tillage production systems and, by effectively shortening the production cycle for soybeans, enabled many farmers to plant a second crop of soybeans after wheat in the same season. In addition, second generation GM HT soybeans, now widely used in North America, are delivering higher yields, as are the new ‘stacked’ traited HT and IR soybeans being used in South America since 2013.

In relation to HT crops, over reliance on the use of glyphosate and the lack of crop and herbicide rotation by farmers, in some regions, has contributed to the development of weed resistance. To address this problem and maintain good levels of weed control, farmers have increasingly adopted more integrated weed management strategies incorporating a mix of herbicides, other HT crops and cultural weed control measures (in other words using other herbicides with glyphosate rather than solely relying on glyphosate, using HT crops which are tolerant to other herbicides, such as glufosinate
and usin GM HT
producti current
conventi t economic
benefits

Overall, e, and
summar f crop
biotechn e reasons
why he
techn , and the
many ot es below)
and to d

METH

Article contents
Related research

The report is based on extensive analysis of existing farm level impact data for GM crops, much of which can be found in peer reviewed literature. Most of this literature broadly refers to itself as ‘economic impact’ literature and applies farm accounting or partial budget approaches to assess the impact of GM crop technology on revenue, key costs of production (notably cost of seed, weed control, pest control and use of labor) and gross farm income. While primary data for impacts of commercial cultivation were not available for every crop, in every year and for each country, a substantial body of representative research and analysis is available and this has been used as the basis for the analysis presented. In addition, the authors have undertaken their own analysis of the impact of some trait-crop combinations in some countries (notably GM herbicide tolerant (HT) traits in North and South America) based on herbicide usage and cost data.

As indicated in earlier papers, the ‘economic’ impact of this technology at the farm level varies widely, both between and within regions/countries. Therefore, the measurement of impact is considered on a case by case basis in terms of crop and trait combinations and is based on the average performance and impact recorded in different crops by the studies reviewed. Where more than one piece of relevant research (eg, on the impact of using a GM trait on the yield of a crop in one country in a particular year) has been identified, the findings used in this analysis reflect the
authors
sentative of
impact i
he impact
of GM in
esentative of
cotton g
local and
unrepres
ative
research
he
referenc

This
chnology for
some
chnology
has prov
crop,
location
te available
impact c
. In addition,
if the on
t basing
current
nature of

×

weaknesses. To reduce the possibilities of over/understating impact due to these factors, the analysis:

- Directly applies impacts identified from the literature to the years that have been studied. As a result, the impacts used vary in many cases according to the findings of literature covering different years. Examples where such data are available include the impact of GM insect resistant (IR) cotton: in India (see Bennett et al. (2004); IMRB (2006) and IMRB (2007)), in Mexico (see Traxler andGodoy-Avila (2004) and Monsanto Mexico annual monitoring reports submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture in Mexico) and in the US (see Sankala and Blumenthal (2003, 2005), Mullins and Hudson (2004)). Hence, the analysis takes into account variation in the impact of the technology on yield according to its effectiveness in dealing with (annual) fluctuations in pest and weed infestation levels;

- Uses current farm level crop prices and bases any yield impacts on (adjusted – see below) current average yields. This introduces a degree of dynamic analysis that would, otherwise, be missing if constant prices and average yields identified in year-specific studies had been used;

- It includes some changes and updates to the impact assumptions identified in the literature based on new papers, annual consultation with local sources (analysts, indust and some
'own a

- Adjust y has
been i ld
enhan on is not
overst

Detai tion of the
2015 s of the
impacts

Other as m income
are as fo

- Where re
analyz is

be) available and used by farmers and there are studies that have assessed trait-specific impacts;

- All values presented are nominal for the year shown and the base currency used is the US dollar. All financial impacts in other currencies have been converted to US dollars at prevailing annual average exchange rates for each year (source: United States Department of Agriculture Economics Research Service);

- The analysis focuses on changes in farm income in each year arising from impact of GM technology on yields, key costs of production (notably seed cost and crop protection expenditure but also impact on costs such as fuel and labor. Inclusion of these costs is, however, more limited than the impacts on seed and crop protection costs because only a few of the papers reviewed have included consideration of such costs in their analysis. In most cases the analysis relates to impact of crop protection and seed cost only, crop quality (eg, improvements in quality arising from less pest damage or lower levels of weed impurities which result in price premia being obtained from buyers) and the scope for facilitating the planting of a second crop in a season (eg, second crop soybeans in Argentina following wheat that would, in the absence of the GM HT seed, probably not have been planted). Thus, the farm income effect measured is essentially a gross margin impact (impact on gross revenue less variable costs of production) rather than a full net cost of
produc pplication
of actu takes into
accou nd world
prices.

The pap gy at the
crop lev perspective
of the rom the yield
impa in relation to
soybean or 2015) are
shown ir

DISCL

FUNDING

The authors acknowledge that funding toward the researching of this article was provided by Monsanto. The material presented in this paper is, however, the independent views of the authors – it is a standard condition for all work undertaken by PG Economics that all reports are independently and objectively compiled without influence from funding sponsors.

REFERENCES

1. Bennett R, Ismael Y, Kambhampati U, Morse S. Economic impacts of GM cotton in India. AgBioforum 2004; 7(3):96–100.
   Google Scholar

2. Brookes G. The farm level impact of using Bt maize in Spain, ICABR conference paper 2003, Ravello, Italy. Also on www.pgeconomics.co.uk
   Goog

3. Brook omania.
   Agbio
   Goog

4. Brook EU: first
   re
   https:

5. Brook cts 1996–
   2007. 4–208.
   Goog

Article contents
Related research

6. Brookes G, Barfoot P. The income and production effects of biotech crops globally 1996–2009. Int J Biotechnol 2011; 12(1/2):1–49; https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBT.2011.042680
Google Scholar

7. Brookes G, Barfoot P. The income and production effects of biotech crops globally 1996–2010. GM Crops Food 2012; 3(4):265–73; PMID:22750951; https://doi.org/10.4161/gmcr.20097
PubMed | Google Scholar

8. Brookes G, Barfoot P. The income and production effects of biotech crops globally 1996–2011. GM Crops 2013; 4(1):1–10; https://doi.org/10.4161/gmcr.22748
Google Scholar

9. Brookes G, Barfoot P. Economic impact of GM crops: the global income and production effects 1996–2012. GM Crops Food 2014; 5(1):65–75; PMID:24637520; https://doi.org/10.4161/gmcr.28098
PubMed | Google Scholar

0. Brook crop
techn
https:/

1. Brook crop
techn
htt

2. Canol sgenic
canol
Goog

3. Carpe ates, 2002,

Article contents | Related research

Google Scholar

14. CSIRO. The cotton consultants Australia 2005 Bollgard II comparison report, CSIRO, Australia.
Google Scholar

15. Doyle B. The Performance of Roundup Ready cotton 2001–2002 in the Australian cotton sector, 2003, University of New England, Armidale, Australia.
Google Scholar

16. Doyle B. The Performance of Ingard and Bollgard II Cotton in Australia during the 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 seasons, 2005, University of New England, Armidale, Australia.
Google Scholar

17. Elena M. Economic advantages of transgenic cotton in Argentina, INTA, 2006, cited in Trigo and CAP 2006.
Google Scholar

18. Falck Zepeda J, Sanders A, Trabanino R, Medina O, Batallas-Huacon R. Small 'resource poor' … : the case of insect … esented to the 13 …
Goog

19. Falck … ught betwe … doption of GM …
Goog

20. Fernar … 9, paper preser …
Goog

Article contents
Related research

21. Fischer J, Tozer P. Evaluation of the environmental and economic impact of Roundup Ready canola in the Western Australian crop production system, 2009, Curtin University of Technology Technical Report 11/2009.
Google Scholar

22. Fitt G. Deployment and impact of transgenic Bt cotton in Australia, reported in James C (2001), Global review of commercialised transgenic crops: 2001 feature: Bt cotton, ISAAA.
Google Scholar

23. Galveo A. Unpublished data on first survey findings of impact of insect resistant corn (first crop) in Brazil, 2009, Celeres, Brazil. www.celeres.co.br
Google Scholar

24. Galveo A. Farm survey findings of impact of insect resistant corn and herbicide tolerant soybeans in Brazil. 2010, Celeres, Brazil. www.celeres.co.br.
Google Scholar

25. Galveo A. Farm survey findings of impact of GM crops in Brazil 2012, Celeres, Brazil.
www.celeres.co.br
Goog

26. Galve eres, Brazil.
www.c
Goog

27. Galve zil, 2010,
20
Goog

28. Georg cial
cultiva report for
Monsa
Goog

29. Gomez-Barbero M, Barbel J, Rodriguez-Cerezo E. Adoption and performance of the first GM crop in EU agriculture: Bt maize in Spain. 2008. JRC, EU Commission. Eur 22778. http://www.jrc.ec.europa.eu.
Google Scholar

30. Gonsales L. Harnessing the benefits of biotechnology: the case of Bt corn in the Philippines. 2005, ISBN 971-91904-6-9. Strive Foundation, Laguna, Philippines.
Google Scholar

31. Gonsales L. Modern Biotechnology and Agriculture: a history of the commercialisation of biotechnology maize in the Philippines, 2009, Strive Foundation, Los Banos, Philippines, ISBN 978-971-91904-8-6.
Google Scholar

32. Gouse M, Piesse J, Thirtle C. Output & labour effect of GM maize and minimum tillage in a communal area of Kwazulu-Natal. J Dev Perspect 2006; 2(2):192–207.
Google Scholar

33. Gouse M, Pray C, Kirsten J, Schimmelpfennig D. A GM subsistence crop in Africa: the case of Bt white maize in S Africa. Int J Biotechnol 2005; 7(1/2/3):84–94;
https:/

34. Gouse esistant
maize (1):15–22.
Goog

35. Gu M HT canola
for pr
Goog

36. Herrin erience.
Econo
Goog

Article contents
Related research

37. Hudson D. Evaluation of agronomic, environmental, economic and co-existence impacts following the introduction of GM canola in Australia 2010–2012. Paper presented to the 2012 GMCC conference, Lisbon, Portugal, November 2013.
Google Scholar

38. Hutchison W, Burkness EC, Mitchel PD, Moon RD, Leslie TW, Fleicher SJ, Abrahamson M, Hamilton KL, Steffey KL, Gray ME et al. Area-wide suppression of European Corn Borer with Bt maize reaps savings to non-bt maize growers. Science 2010; 330:222–5. www.sciencemag.org; PMID:20929774; https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1190242
PubMed | Web of Science ® | Google Scholar

39. IMRB. Socio-economic benefits of Bollgard and product satisfaction (in India), IMRB International, 2006, Mumbai, India.
Google Scholar

40. IMRB. Socio-economic benefits of Bollgard and product satisfaction (in India), IMRB International, 2007, Mumbai, India.
Google Scholar

41. Ismael Y, Bennet R, Morse S. Benefits of bt cotton use by smallholder farmers in
South
Goog

42. James Bt cotton,
ISAAA
Goog

43. Ja Bt maize,
ISAAA
Goog

44. Johnso technology-
derive .
Goog

45. Jon-Joseph AQ, Sprague CL. Weed management in wide-and narrow-row glyphosate resistant sugar beet. Weed Technol 2010; 24:523–8; https://doi.org/10.1614/WT-D-10-00033.1

Web of Science ® | Google Scholar

46. Kathage J, Qaim M. PNAS 2012. Economic impacts and impact dynamics of Bt cotton in India. Available at: http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1203647109

Google Scholar

47. Khan M. Roundup Ready sugar beet in America. British Sugar Beet Rev Winter 2008; 76(4):16–9.

Google Scholar

48. Kirsten J, Gouse M. Bt cotton in South Africa: adoption and the impact on farm incomes amongst small-scale and large-scale farmers, ICABR conference, Ravello, Italy 2002.

Google Scholar

49. Kniss A. Comparison of conventional and glyphosate resistant sugarbeet the year of comm

https:

50. Kouse … Bt cotton in

Pakist … gec.12014

51. Ko … ide use in

Pakist

https:

52. Marra … assessment

of the … ngton, USA.

×

53. MB Agro. Intacta soybeans: An economic view of the benefits of adopting the new technology, 2014 report commissioned by Monsanto Brazil.
Google Scholar

54. Mendez K, Chaparro Giraldo A, Reyes Moreno G, Silva Castro C. Production cost analysis and use of pesticides in the transgenic and conventional crop in the valley of San Juan (Colombia). GM Crops 2011; 2(3):163–8; PMID:22008311; https://doi.org/10.4161/gmcr.2.3.17591
PubMed | Google Scholar

55. Monsanto Australia. Survey of herbicide tolerant canola licence holders 2008.
Google Scholar

56. Monsanto Brazil. Farm survey of conventional and Bt cotton growers in Brazil 2007, unpublished.
Google Scholar

57. Monsanto Romania. Unpublished results of farmer survey amongst soybean growers in 2006 – published in 2007.
Google Scholar

58. Mullin parisons,
2004 I
Goog

59. Nazli varieties in
Pakist sociation
20
Goog

60. Norsw gement
practi t Weeds
Specia
Goog

Article contents
Related research

1. Parana Department of Agriculture. Cost of production comparison: biotech and conventional soybeans, in USDA GAIN report, 2004, BR4629 of 11 November 2004. www.fas.usad.gov/gainfiles/200411/146118108.pdf.
Google Scholar

2. Pray C, Hunag J, Hu R, Roselle S. Five years of Bt cotton in China – the benefits continue. Plant J 2002; 31(4):423–30; PMID:12182701; https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-313X.2002.01401.x
| PubMed | Web of Science ® | Google Scholar

3. Qaim M, De Janvry A. Bt cotton in Argentina: analysing adoption and farmers' willingness to pay, 2002, American Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meeting, California.
Google Scholar

4. Qaim M, De Janvry A. Bt cotton and pesticide use in Argentina: economic and environmental effects. Environ Dev Econom 2005; 10:179–200; https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355770X04001883
| Web of Science ® | Google Scholar

5. Qaim ggregate
welfar

6. Ramo ce
mana hilippines
(BCP)
G

7. Rice M mic and
enviro 01-01-RV.
Goog

8. Riesg or non-GM

middle Ebro Valley, Spain. Spanish J Agricultural Res 2012; 10(4):867–76; https://doi.org/10.5424/sjar/2012104-448-11
Web of Science ® | Google Scholar

69. Sankala S, Blumenthal E. Impacts on US agriculture of biotechnology-derived crops planted in 2003- an update of eleven case studies, 2003. NCFAP, Washington. www.ncfap.org.
Google Scholar

70. Sankala S, Blumenthal E. Impacts on US agriculture of biotechnology-derived crops planted in 2005- an update of eleven case studies, 2005 NCFAP, Washington. www.ncfap.org.
Google Scholar

71. Traxler G, Godoy-Avila S. Transgenic cotton in Mexico. Agbioforum 2004; 7(1&2):57–62.
Google Scholar

72. Trigo E. Genetically Modified Crops in Argentina agriculture: an opened story. 2002, Libros
Goog

73. Trigo E 2006.
http:// ulture_02_01
_07.pc
.
Goog

74. USD 0025 of
14th J
Goog

75. Van de for the
2008/
Goog

76. Vitale J. Impact of Bollgard II on the Socio Economic and Health Welfare of Smallholder Cotton Farmers in Burkina Faso: Results of the 2009 Field Survey14th ICABR conference, Ravello, Italy, June 2010.

Google Scholar

77. Vitale J, Glick H, Greenplate J, Traore O. The economic impact of 2nd generation Bt cotton in West Africa: empirical evidence from Burkina Faso. Int J Biotechnol 2008; 10(2/3):167–83; https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBT.2008.018352

Google Scholar

78. Yorobe J. Economics impact of Bt corn in the Philippines, 2004, Paper presented to the 45th PAEDA Convention, Querzon City.

Google Scholar

79. Zambrano P. Insect resistant cotton in Colombia: impact on farmers, paper presented to the 13th ICABR conference, 2009, Ravello, Italy.

Google Scholar

Appen m income calcul

GM IR

Table

Do

GM IR

Download CSV Display Table

GM IR cotton 2015

Table

Download CSV Display Table

GM HT soybeans 2015 (excluding second crop soybeans – see separate table)

Table

Download CSV Display Table

GM IR

Table

Do

GM HT

Download CSV Display Table

GM HT cotton 2015

Table

Download CSV Display Table

GM HT canola 2015

Table

Download CSV Display Table

GM vi

Table

Do

GM he

Table

Download CSV Display Table

Second soybean crop benefits: Argentina

An additional farm income benefit that many Argentine soybean growers have derived comes from the additional scope for second cropping of soybeans. This has arisen because of the simplicity, ease and weed management flexibility provided by the (GM) technology which has been an important factor facilitating the use of no and reduced tillage production systems. In turn the adoption of low/no tillage production systems has reduced the time required for harvesting and drilling subsequent crops and hence has enabled many Argentine farmers to cultivate 2 crops (wheat followed by soybeans) in one season. As such, the proportion of soybean production in Argentina using no or low tillage methods has increased from 34% in 1996 to 90% by 2005 and has remained at over 90% since then.

Farm level income impact of using GM HT soybeans in Argentina 1996–2015 (2): Second crop soybeans

Table

Downlo

Base yield gain

To avoid ies have
identifie al level)
yields us n levels
based o on values
based o

Article contents Related research

Example: GM IR cotton (2015)

Table

Download CSV Display Table

Appendix 2: Impacts, assumptions, rationale and sources for all trait/country combinations

IR corn (resistant to corn boring pests)

Table

Download CSV Display Table

Readers should note that the assumptions are drawn from the references cited supplemented and updated by industry sources (where the authors have not been able
to identi e of the
herbicid ries.
Accordir ed
informat sts of crop
protectic e authors
are conf veral cases,
informat as
sugge dependent
studi data has
been use

Downloac

Article contents Related research

Information for
Authors
R&D professionals
Editors
Librarians
Societies

Open access
Overview
Open journals
Open Select
Dove Medical Press
F1000Research

Opportunities
Reprints and e-prints
Advertising solutions
Accelerated publication
Corporate access solutions

Help and information
Help and contact
Newsroom
All journals
Books

Keep up to date
Register to receive personalised research and resources by email
Sign

Copyright
Accessib

Regist
5 How

or & Francis Group
orma business

Article contents
Related research